DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 425 777 JC 990 026

TITLE	The Future of the Community College: A Faculty Perspective.
INSTITUTION	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	26p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; College Role; *Community Colleges; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; *Faculty College Relationship; *Futures (of Society); Institutional Evaluation; Program Evaluation; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

This booklet discusses the future of California community colleges from a faculty perspective. Publication of this perspective was made in response to the many critics who have called for the radical restructuring of community colleges. It responds to those who demand that the colleges function as business corporations, complete with customers and markets, and uses the occasion to engage in an assessment of strengths and weaknesses. The document aims to map a course for the future, and describes resolutions S971.2, "Faculty Perspectives on the Future;" S971.5, "Redefining Faculty Productivity;" and F975.8, "Academic Excellence." Together these resolutions put forward an extensive set of basic principles and commitments for California educators. Included in the booklet are the following sections: (1) History and Background; (2) Synopsis; (3) Introduction; (4) The Past; (5) The Present; and (6) The Future. Faculty conclude that, in essential ways, the future of the community college should look very much like the present. They also conclude that community colleges have already evolved into lifelong learning centers. (Contains 40 citations.) (AS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 425 777

The Future of the Community College: A Faculty Perspective

Adopted Fall 1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R. M. Silverman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The Future of the Community College: A Faculty Perspective

The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges

1997-98 Educational Policies Committee
Janis Perry, Chair, Santa Ana College
Linda Collins, Los Medanos College
Lin Marelick, Mission College
Richard Rose, Santa Rosa College
Hoke Simpson, Grossmont College
Kathy Sproles, Hartnell College
Chris Storer, De Anza College
Ian Walton, Mission College
David Wilkinson, Santa Barbara City College, Student Senate Representative

1998-99 Educational Policies Committee
Janis Perry, Chair, Santiago Canyon College
Linda Collins, Los Medanos College
Diane Glow, San Diego Miramar College
Elton Hall, Moorpark College
Mary Rider, Grossmont College
Hoke Simpson, Grossmont College
Kathy Sproles, Hartnell College
Ian Walton, Mission College
Eva Conrad, Moorpark College, CIO Representative

Table of Contents

History and Background 1

Synopsis 2

Introduction 5

The Past 6

The Present 7

The Future 11

Conclusion 17

Endnotes 19

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

In the past few years, California community colleges have been the target of considerable criticism and calls for their restructuring. Much of this criticism has seemed to faculty to be misplaced and to reflect a failure to understand the nature of our enterprise. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges determined that it would be appropriate to respond to these critics, and to use the occasion to engage in a critical assessment of strengths and weaknesses and, based on this analysis, to map a course for the future. This undertaking is a response to the following resolutions, passed in the Fall and Spring 1997 Plenary Sessions of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges:

S97 1.2 Faculty Perspective on the Future

Whereas during the last decade there have been numerous documents published by non-academic entities recommending the future direction of higher education in California, and

Whereas each of these documents evokes a sense of impending crisis to propel politically expedient solutions, and

Whereas these documents do not reflect academic expertise or faculty perspectives, and

Whereas the Board of Governors are considering a number of these policy documents as they frame their perspective for the future of California community colleges,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges urge the Executive Committee to develop a position paper articulating the faculty perspective on the future direction of the California community colleges, and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges include the following steps in preparing a faculty perspective for the future for California community colleges:

1. *Discuss, define, and decide on values*
2. *Discuss and define our mission*
3. *Formulate a brief but "catching" vision derived from values and mission*
4. *Consider ways to make the vision a reality.*

S97 1.5 Redefining "Faculty Productivity"

Whereas productivity models such as TQM/CQI are being promoted as a means to restructure the academy, and

Whereas often these models take the form of a narrow application of productivity models, and

Whereas a review of the literature raises serious questions as to the appropriateness of such models in the academy setting, and

Whereas a faculty driven process would examine the components of educational excellence,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges does not endorse the use of TQM/CQI as a model for restructuring the education process, and

Be it further resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct the Executive Committee to develop a position paper that defines quality in terms of educational excellence and thus addresses calls for increased faculty productivity.

F97 5.8 Academic Excellence

Whereas proposals to increase community college funding that have titles such as "Academic Excellence" suggest that our colleges are not already doing an excellent job, and

Whereas there is information that reflects the great success of community college programs in preparing students for transfer, job skills, and citizenship, and

Whereas the public and its legislative representatives should be better informed about the successes of California community colleges,

Therefore be it resolved that the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges direct its Executive Committee to develop a statement for public information that documents the successes of California community colleges.

SYNOPSIS

To posit a vision, faculty need in essence to "go back to the future." The California Master Plan for Higher Education and AB1725 and the history of the community college movement itself contain the seeds of a visionary but incompletely realized plan for democratic and excellent education open and affordable to all of California's residents. Taken together they constitute the basis for a defense and a renewal of, a celebration of and a rededication to, the California community colleges.

AB1725 is a remarkable document. Its grandiloquent prose is unusual for legislative language. It projects a picture of inclusive, multicultural, responsive, responsible, locally-based institutions of higher learning. These institutions are to be comprehensive in mission, serving multiple and overlapping needs in occupational, transfer and general education, and basic skills. This is to be accomplished with a well trained, professionally empowered, diverse faculty who, after rigorous

scrutiny in a process of earned tenure are accorded the respect and the tools by which to effectively develop and implement high quality curriculum and educational programs. It was envisioned that funding would be made adequate to maintain high standards and faculty ratios to teach an increasingly diverse set of citizens. These institutions would prepare citizens in an increasingly global world wherein knowledge and information become the currency of exchange. In the future addressed by AB1725, all will need, and can have, the benefits of permeable and open access to life-long learning in well equipped and democratically governed, community based institutions of high caliber.

It is all in there, but it is not yet all out there—in our colleges, in our classrooms, in our communities, or in our students' lives and aspirations.

Faculty must build on that vision and enlarge it. These documents codify a set of basic principles and commitments for the people of California. In this vision, California community colleges would be:

- dedicated to the centrality of teaching and learning:
  - centered on teaching as a relational activity;
  - staffed by full-time, tenured faculty;
  - maintained by the tradition of academic freedom, keeping alive a public space for literate discourse in all communities; and
  - facilitated by faculty-led curricular processes;
- dedicated to collegial governance through an organized and effective Academic Senate and local academic senates;
- committed to a comprehensive curriculum and program offerings;
- dedicated to providing a general education of both depth and breadth for all students—connecting them to the diverse traditions of the human community, promoting both ethical reasoning and critical capacities while enabling them to lead richer lives;
- rededicated to the transfer function, which provides for both upward mobility and increased status, and provides a workforce for the vital occupations of our communities;
- committed to providing current and complete occupational offerings and preparing students for full participation in economic as well as social and civic life;
- committed to the best thinking and practices regarding interdisciplinary courses and varied teaching strategies, supported by faculty-defined professional development;
- dedicated to an improved and more integrated approach to developmental education to enhance and improve student success;
- responsive to working people faced with multiple and demanding roles in supporting themselves and their children, which would include such support services as counseling, matriculation, child care and technology available for their use, and flexible scheduling;
- sufficiently funded to support a high level of student enrollment, to ensure high program standards, and to guarantee universal access without enrollment fees;

- supportive of students' financial needs and sympathetic to their needs as workers, parents and people in transition;
- dedicated to a respect and appreciation for diversity, to infusing multicultural approaches and perspectives throughout the curriculum, and to hiring practices which result in a faculty reflective of the diverse population of California;
- generative of balanced economic development, including creative but prudent and sound partnerships, with a shared responsibility on the part of business and industry;
- responsive to a range of economic and service needs, of both small and large businesses, and public as well as private agencies;
- efficiently administered by educational administrators centered on supporting teaching and learning as their prime commitment;
- rededicated to improved accountability functions of peer review, program review, accreditation and self study, matriculation site visits, and student and community involvement in assessment and planning of college services;
- equipped to promote access to technology, and committed to the application of critical thinking skills to determine the effective use and transformation of the many new information technologies for humane ends; and
- committed to providing an education that is maximally productive of humane values and which contributes toward students becoming informed, compassionate and productive members of their communities.

In short, faculty are committed to vibrant, alive, professional, mature, socially responsible and fair institutions of higher education, which welcome all and foster both healthy individuals and communities.

In order to realize this vision, faculty must next expand their discussions:

- about system governance;
- about our commitment to diversity;
- about distance education, the rise of technology and the socioeconomic implications of differential access to it; and
- about the kinds of educational administration most conducive to furthering their vision and their students' dreams.

This must be done in ways which foster deep discussion and honest exchange, while avoiding splitting faculty and fracturing our educational community.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to define the future of the California community colleges from a faculty perspective. The sense of urgency associated with the publishing of this perspective is the product of the din of voices calling for the radical restructuring of the community college. In the name of "accountability," faculty and administrators are confronted with the demand that they apply quantitative measures to what is essentially a qualitative enterprise: education, the actualizing of the potential of human beings.

To generate a faculty vision in answer to and rebuttal of those with their own educational agendas, faculty must take care to avoid their mistakes. If others are blind to much of value in education and would gamble that value against an uncertain future, faculty must ensure that their view of the future is not simply an unreflective justification of the present.

One of the most common elements among the apostles of change is a focus on perceived "trends" and a readiness to spend our resources preparing for the reality that these trends imply. The problem is that the trends are often mutually contradictory. Faculty are often warned that the private sector is posing a serious competitive threat. At the same time, they are warned about being drowned by Tidal Wave II, confronted with more students than they can handle, unless modes of delivery are radically restructured, the lecture is given up, and their processes become more efficient and productive.

The faculty's approach to the future is more prescriptive. While acknowledging certain fundamental social changes (such as the shift from an industrial to a "knowledge-based" economy[1]), the faculty intend, within those parameters, to spell out a vision of what the future *ought* to look like. Where faculty believe that changes in ways of doing things would be beneficial, that will be acknowledged, understanding that all recommendations are shaped by a single overarching ideal, and that is that community colleges should offer the sort of instruction that is maximally productive of humane values and which contributes toward students becoming informed, compassionate and productive members of their communities. The faculty believe, with many before them, that democracy requires an educated citizenry, literate people who are capable of making informed choices, and that the development of such citizens should be the primary task of a "democratic" educational system.[2]

Too much emphasis is often placed on students bettering their economic prospects through the acquisition of technical skills. This is, of course, one function of the community college. However, even in those cases where students seek no more than the acquisition of work content skills, community college instruction should strive toward the end that students leave having become more complete human beings than they were before. In the final analysis, human beings are defined by what they care about, and to the extent that one's focus is exclusively economic, one's life is unduly truncated.

Community colleges have a remarkable history of contributing to the development of the whole person. There seems to be among community college personnel a tacit understanding that they have a chance—and often it's a last chance—to make a significant difference in the lives of students. This, faculty believe, is what accounts for the edge, or the zeal, that has made community colleges the best teaching institutions in American education.

The plan in what follows is to look first at the history of the community college, looking there for its uniqueness, for the added value it has brought to America's system of higher education, and for those features that are worth preserving into the future. At the same time, notice will be taken of weaknesses and outright failures, to determine what needs shoring up, or simply to be abandoned. Next the present will be observed, taking inventory of the many calls to restructure the community college, and attempting to separate what is legitimate from what is merely self-promoting and/or positively deleterious. Finally, a faculty vision of the community college of the first two decades of the twenty-first century will be offered, a vision which, as indicated earlier, will be more prescriptive than predictive, and which is strongly rooted in a traditional humanism.

THE PAST

At the turn of the last century, leaders at a number of the country's major universities—William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago, Alexis F. Lange of Berkeley, and David Starr Jordan of Stanford, for example—believed that the education of freshmen and sophomores was a drain on their resources and should really be a function of extended high school training, leaving the universities to perform their primary functions of research and advanced training in the professions. Harper paved the way for this arrangement by dividing the curriculum at the University of Chicago into two tiers, designated as the Junior College and the Senior College. He then successfully persuaded J. Stanley Brown, the principal of Joliet High School, to develop a junior college curriculum, and in 1901 the country's first public junior college opened at Joliet.[3] Six years later the California Legislature granted high school governing boards the right to offer the first two years of college work, and in 1910 the first public junior college opened in Fresno as part of the local high school.[4]

With the advent of WWI and a concomitant precipitous decline in enrollments, the universities began to realize the extent to which they depended for revenues on freshman and sophomore populations, and they became disenchanted with the project of amputating those first two years of instruction. At the end of the war, the universities were faced with the converse problem: a spike in the demand for entry into post-secondary education led to the perception that a principal function of the junior college was, as Lange put it, "to prevent annual cloudbursts of freshmen and sophomores from drowning the university proper."[5]

The elitist sentiments of the university sponsors of the junior colleges were unmistakable. Writing in 1915, Lange saw these "upward extension[s] of the high school" as receptacles for "the great mass of high school graduates who cannot, will not, should not, become university students."[6] William Rainey Harper created the associate's degree for those who completed the Junior College

at the University of Chicago, with the purpose of encouraging students to "give up college work at the end of the sophomore year."[7]

A variation on this theme—that one role of the two-year college would be to track students into a path leading away from a baccalaureate degree—appeared with the formation of the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC) in 1920. The leaders of this group recognized that the four-year institutions had already cornered the market on training for the professions, and determined that the educational niche that the two-year schools might claim for their own was that of vocational training.[8] Thus began a push to define the primary function of the two-year college that has persisted to this day, and whose principal opponents have been, from its inception, the students themselves.[9] The American public has always seen the junior/community college primarily as a gateway to higher education, and the stated educational goal of a substantial percentage of incoming community college freshmen today is still the attainment of a four-year degree.[10] The opposition of the students, however, never deterred the vocational vision of the AAJC, which finally got a huge boost toward legitimization in the 1970s. It was in this decade that Americans began to hear that the attainment of a baccalaureate was no longer a sure ticket to employment. The media was replete with accounts of Ph.D.s driving taxicabs and the accompanying conclusion that higher education was an expensive waste of time and effort.[11] In fact, the media hype of the '70s was considerably overblown, as the statistics on employability and earning potential still showed a decisive advantage to those with four-year degrees.[12] Nevertheless, the seeds of doubt had been sown, and students began to view two-year vocational programs as a legitimate alternative to the four-year degree, and began signing up for them in unprecedented numbers. (That is not to say that the transfer function was displaced; in fact, a poll conducted in 1980 showed that 48% of Americans still perceived preparation for transfer to be the principal task of the community college, and only 28% saw vocational training as its top priority.)[13]

Fortunately, the community college has not been defined either by the elitist aims of those who have attempted to shape its destiny, or by its graduation and transfer statistics, which, as raw data, are not terribly impressive.[14] Instead, the creation of the community college is generally acknowledged to be the most significant contribution to American higher education in this century, and its perceived success has resulted in remarkable growth at home and imitation abroad. Where, then, does its value lie?

THE PRESENT

It is clear that the practitioners of community college education in California have never consciously embraced the historically defined "cooling out" function of the community colleges.[15] To the contrary, faculty, staff and administrators have seen themselves as engaged in a "heating up" of students' aspirations, and as satisfying the wide spectrum of educational needs of their student bodies. While it may be true that the numbers of community college students who transfer directly to the CSU and UC systems seem small, nevertheless, 60% to 80% of the students receiving baccalaureate degrees in California report that they have done at least some of

their undergraduate work at a community college.[16] In the vocational area, millions of Californians have taken classes at a community college in order to upgrade their skills, and many millions more have taken classes for personal enrichment. It seems that the Truman Commission of 1948 was right in recommending that the two-year schools be designated "community" rather than "junior" colleges,[17] for the function of these institutions has long ago gone far beyond that of either "transfer" or "vocational training." They have become, rather, life-long learning centers, serving virtually every conceivable post-secondary educational need of their communities, often becoming the community's cultural center as well.

If one were to visit a class on "An Introduction to the Internet" on any community college campus, one would see there in microcosm what the community college truly is. Among the students would be Computer Science majors pursuing a transfer curriculum, others aiming at a two-year certificate in the field, some students who have found that Internet use was required in their other classes and who wanted a leg up on the technology, and a majority who were "general interest" students, simply wanting to know more about the Internet, and these would range in age and occupation from high school seniors, to local business people, to members of the college staff and retirees in their sixties and seventies.

Statistics on student satisfaction have only recently begun to be gathered, but public support for community colleges speaks for itself in this regard: the students who pass through their doors go back into the community with positive reports on the services received at their hands. When one considers the qualifications of community college faculty, this is not surprising, for these are people with advanced degrees and extensive professional experience, and thus thoroughly knowledgeable in their subjects, who have made the decision to dedicate their lives to teaching rather than research. Moreover, they function in an "ideal"environment, in that their students are there by choice, and they are hired and evaluated primarily for their teaching effectiveness. Finally, as mentioned earlier, community college faculty often develop what is virtually a missionary zeal for their profession, and all of these factors result, predictably, in the two-year college standing well above the other segments of the American educational system for sheer quality of instruction.

Given the remarkable success of the community college in satisfying the multifarious educational needs of the contemporary American community, and the foresight of California community colleges in recognizing and insisting upon the importance of a comprehensive curriculum in fostering full educational opportunity for students, what is behind the call for a radical restructuring? A look at who is doing the calling and what, specifically, they are calling for will advance our understanding considerably.

In the first section of this paper, attention was called to the "design" on the part of many who would shape the definition of the community college to track students away from the pursuit of four-year degrees and into "more modest" vocational channels. This was part of an effort to "rationalize" America's educational system, by bringing it into harmony with the economic and class structure of the larger society.[18] In California, this meant that the UC system and the elite private universities like Stanford, USC and the Claremont colleges would turn out those destined

for the top of the economic ladder (the physicians and surgeons, and hospital executives); the CSU system, those destined to occupy the second rung (the hospital administrators and mid-level managers, the professional nursing administrators and educators); the community colleges, the third rung (the registered and licensed vocational nurses, the paraprofessional aides and paramedics, and the technicians and clerical supervisors); and the secondary schools, the next lower rung (those who type and file, cook and clean, build and repair facilities, and sort and deliver supplies).[19]

Today, the criticisms of public higher education and the remedies prescribed seem, again, to constitute an attempt to square educational and economic realities. This time, however, the goal is not to create parallel hierarchies (that has already been accomplished). Rather, the aim is now to impose modes of management on educational institutions in imitation of the managerial techniques of transnational corporations, with the effect of rendering educational institutions an extension of the marketplace and, in the bargain, virtually deifying those at the top of the managerial class, in both business and education alike.[20]

The impetus for restructuring arises from a perceived set of problems, comprising "a troubling nexus of rising costs, reduced federal and state funding, stagnant enrollment pools, a generalized sense that graduates of public institutions are only marginally competent..." and the threat of privatization, or of competition from the private sector.[21] Public educational institutions are warned that, as a matter of survival, they had better adopt the "lean and mean" style of the transnational corporations and apply the management strategies of TQM (Total Quality Management) and its educational sibling, CQI (Continuous Quality Improvement) to their organizations. The adoption of TQM/CQI in the management of educational institutions is potentially disastrous in several respects. First, the aim of TQM is productivity, conceived as "getting more from less." Since "more is not necessarily better...the slogan 'getting more from less,' used as a pro forma marker of quality, is oxymoronic."[22] This purely quantitative conception of quality applied to education reduces educational value to a cash nexus, and places us squarely on the path of the diploma mill. Furthermore, one of the principal strategies recommended for getting more from less is the formation of "partnerships with industry." While partnerships with industry for the professional development of faculty or the curriculum can be positive relationships, without careful monitoring and planning these can also act to further the colonizing of public education for the purpose of generating profits for business. In the late 1990's increasing numbers of voices—both internal to the California Community Colleges and external to the system—made outright calls for the use of public apportionment funds for the private training of corporate employees in "contract education."

One of the centers of the call for reform of the community college today is the Community College Leadership Program (CCLP) in the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Texas at Austin, directed by John Roueche. Roueche's work exemplifies the common themes of the general "re-engineering" movement in American higher education. In his books and lectures, Roueche consistently makes a number of points:

- Community colleges are in financial trouble due to rising costs coupled with declining state and federal support. Here Roueche offers the same sorts of data found in the recent Rand report, *Breaking the Social Contract*.
- Community colleges need to form "partnerships with industry" as a means of partially overcoming their financial deficits. The colleges offer training in exchange for cash, equipment or services.
- For the first time in their history, community colleges are threatened by competition from the private sector. Roueche likes to point to the online courses offered by the University of Phoenix as his archetype for this threat. He maintains that "virtual colleges" are like shopping malls—they are destined to dominate the market now held by the community colleges, and are only ignored at great peril (as the small, Main Street Mom and Pop stores ignored the malls).
- The world is moving too fast for the response time of traditional education. Institutions need to develop rapid response strategies which include (a) the modularization of courses, (b) the digitization of their content, so that they may be taken more quickly and, ideally, at the learner's convenience from his/her home computer, and (c) the rapid development of new curricula as new skills become required in the workplace.
- Community colleges need to become "customer driven" and focussed on "student outcomes," ensuring that the customer gets what she or he came for. The rapidly responding, customer driven institution is a "learning" institution, as opposed to a "teaching" one. Teachers must abandon the role of "the sage on the stage" and replace it with that of "the guide on the side."
- The faculty are the primary resistors to the implementation of necessary change. Managers, who understand that the college's survival is at stake, must overcome this resistance, a task made inordinately onerous by institutions such as tenure and shared governance.[23]

Several things are noteworthy about Roueche's litany. First, the threat to community colleges, and the appropriate solution, are couched exclusively in economic terms. The threat comes from "under-funding" and competition from more efficient "providers." The solution lies in the community colleges becoming more efficient and raising their productivity ("getting more from less"), and this can be achieved through automation, turning over the work of human beings (in this case, faculty) to complexes of hardware and software (digitized lessons offered up on computers). In other words, the problems faced by the community colleges precisely parallel those faced by the transnational corporations, and thus warrant parallel solutions. The student in this picture is consistently perceived as a "customer/trainee," seeking from the community college only an increase in his/her "employability quotient." Thus teaching (or, the preferred term, "learning") becomes an economic transaction between customer and provider—and if the provider does not deliver a product with sufficient currency and efficiency, the customer will take his/her business elsewhere. In thus reducing "quality," or educational value, to a cash nexus, any discussion of what faculty traditionally mean by "quality education" remains permanently submerged.[24]

Faculty in fact are the "gum on the shoe" in the march toward this brave new world of education. Their subject expertise, to the extent that it leads them to suppose that they might know better than the "customer" what the customer needs, is a liability. One author, in a recent edition of *Leadership Abstracts*, wrote that Microsoft and Disney, not faculty, would be supplying the course content of the future.[25] The niche for the community colleges, he suggested, will lie in the areas of matriculation and record keeping. This vision of a faculty-less future represents the ultimate in educational downsizing, and leaves in place those who are truly essential to the organization, the managers.[26] The identification of the CEO as the one true indispensable element of an organization is at the heart of the TQM ideology. As W. Edwards Deming, the movement's founder, wrote, "The job of a leader is to accomplish the transformation of his organization. He possesses knowledge, personality and persuasive power... Quality is determined by the top management. It cannot be delegated."[27]

Based on the understanding and knowledge of the history and role of a quality education, faculty have not endorsed the work of Roueche and the other advocates of the application of TQM/CQI to education. The reasons for not doing so will become clear as faculty spell out their own vision of the future of the community college.

THE FUTURE

The faculty believe that the Rouecheian thesis of economic crisis bears further examination with reference to the California community colleges. While acknowledging that costs are rising, they are not out of control (as they seem to be, say, in the health care industry), and, while state and federal support has diminished, it has not done so perilously. In fact, during the leanest years of the 1990s, community college budgets in California increased substantially every year and are now at their highest points ever.[28] Moreover, in the area of technology—a high-ticket zone with the potential to stress college budgets—California community colleges have received substantial support from the state in the form of block grants. However, the allocations have failed to grow in accordance with the increasing demands placed on the colleges and have not kept pace with the increasing challenges posed by population growth in the state.[29]

Nonetheless, it remains problematic that California community colleges are funded at only some $3,500 per full-time equivalent student, while the national average is about $6,200. This chronic under-funding has been accomplished at student expense—by the raising of fees, the constriction of course offerings, the deferral of maintenance, the postponement of infrastructure investment, and the contraction of student services. It has also been made possible by larger class sizes (California community college classes exceed the national average by 10 students per class) as well as by the harder work of community college faculty in California who teach on average some 25% more than the national average.[30]

Furthermore, the burden of historic underfunding has been expressed primarily in declining access to community college education. According to the 2005 Task Force Report, while overall enrollment continues to reflect the changing demographics of California, the 1995 overall

community college participation rate fell to a low of 57.5 students per 1,000, from a 1975 high of nearly 88 per 1,000. This decline disproportionately impacted historically underrepresented groups. For example, the participation rate of African American males was cut in half, and that of African American females dropped by nearly one-third. The 2005 Report concludes that this trend, combined with continued low Latino participation rates compared to other groups, could have dire consequences for California. This trend clearly must be reversed if California is to recover the dream of universal access so clearly spelled out in the Master Plan. And, for that access to be meaningful, the continued quality of educational offerings must be safeguarded.

The state has only given the community colleges from 10.2% to 10.4% of the mandated 11% share of Proposition 98 funds in recent years.[31] The failure of the state to provide even the guaranteed minimum share of state funds following the passage of Proposition 98 by California voters indicates the unwillingness of certain political leaders to make the tax investment needed to enact the widespread public support for public education.

In the 2005 strategic plan, the California Community Colleges' Board of Governors called for a reinvestment in the community colleges to bring the funding closer to the national average. However, the willingness to trade that investment for the imposition of performance based funding imperils both access and excellence in our colleges. This imposition, it should be noted, occurred at the behest of the Governor's Office and the appointed Board of Governors, not by legislative mandate. For a more complete critique of performance based funding and the attendant threat to access and excellence, see the paper adopted by the Spring 1998 Plenary Session of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges.[32]

Faculty are, perhaps, inclined to accept the thesis of "economic crisis" because they consistently find their educational programs under-funded. In part, this chronic under-funding is the result of the almost universal adoption of budget allocation models which fund district administrative services "off the top" before distributing the remaining unrestricted funds to educational programs. A recommendation to consider for the future, then, is the adoption of allocation models which begin by "funding the class schedule," along with the educational equipment, facilities and services that support it, and which then employ a collegial governance process to determine the necessary level of district administrative services. The Legislature could assist in assuring a "students first" approach to budgeting by imposing more stringent controls on administrative costs than is currently represented by the "50% law," which stipulates that 50% of expenditures must be directly related to instruction.

It is possible that there is also a potential for financial savings in changes to the community college governance structure. Calls for re-examination of the system's governance structure have become a regular feature of a range of outside commissions, panels and editorials. Indeed, the Citizens Commission on Higher Education called not only for the dissolution of multi-college districts, but also for the outright abolition of local governing boards, and moving to a statewide system of governance more akin to that of CSU. In multi-college districts, this would result in immediate

savings through the dissolution of district bureaucracies. They argue that savings in the cost of local elections could be used to fund any expansion of the statewide bureaucracy that was necessary.[33]

It is time for the Academic Senate to enjoin this debate. What features of local control have been beneficial and should be preserved? Which can be attributed to the operation of local boards *per se*, and which can better be attributed to the autonomous operations of local senates and curriculum committees joined by a skein of articulation agreements and faculty as well as administrative professional associations? The disjuncture between local governance boards and loss of taxation authority with the advent of Proposition 13 has spawned calls for statewide restructuring. Some argue that the college, the college administration and the role of the local senates would be enhanced, not diminished, by the abolition of districts (and the position of district chancellor) and local boards. Others maintain that it is precisely the local governing board with its electoral mandate, which preserve the community character and nature of the California system. Research is needed to examine and weigh these claims if they are to be considered carefully, rather than fought out on ideological and political grounds. The Academic Senate must address this matter. Of course, many other voices are and will be active in this debate: local political coalitions, the major political parties, local business interests, as well as collective bargaining agents all have a stake in these arrangements. The Senate's responsibility will be to conduct the debate on the educational plane, to determine whether current arrangements continue to serve students and communities well, or whether they constitute a drag on the system, hampering efforts to ensure quality education to all who enter our portals.

The call for "partnerships with industry" should be hearkened to with great caution. As noted earlier, this call easily translates into the colonization of colleges for the purpose of producing profits for business. At the universities, this has already occurred, with transnational corporations shifting substantial portions of their R&D costs to the universities and, hence, to the public.[34] The danger for the community colleges is that they will simply wind up taking over the employee training function for local industries. In deciding whether to form such partnerships, the community colleges must always ask whether the proposed exchange is going to be of real benefit to students, for it is entirely possible that the students wind up as no more than pawns in such negotiations. Exemplary of this danger is a program in Cleveland, in which local businesspeople funded the training of taxi drivers at Cuyahoga Community College, in order that the drivers might become better "ambassadors" in serving the city's burgeoning tourist industry. It is clear that both the college and local industry profited from this arrangement. It is not at all clear that the cab drivers got anything beyond a few more hours added to their working day on days they attended class.[35]

Should the California community colleges move online in the future and become "virtual colleges?" The answer is "No," for two reasons. First, the proposition that the online offerings of the University of Phoenix will steal the community college market share is patent nonsense. Modern technology has added new levels of interactivity and occasions for engagement to the traditional "correspondence course," and more is promised for the future. Yet most online classes as presently designed remain a form of correspondence course, requiring of learners a high degree

of maturity, motivation and self-discipline if they are to succeed. In fact, Phoenix explicitly directs its efforts to the "mature professional," leaving "the younger student still deciding on a career" for others to educate.[36] There is no doubt that distance learning, in a variety of forms, is with us to stay and will, in the future, open up the opportunity for higher education to many who cannot otherwise get to our classrooms. It should be embraced for this reason, and to the extent that this reason justifies, but not because of a perceived threat to the community college market share.

A second reason why we should not "go virtual" is that to do so would be to abandon the community colleges' greatest strength, which is the excellence of their teaching. The magic that occurs everyday in community college classrooms, the lives that are changed forever because instructors are present there with them, is the core of the true "quality" of the education offered in California community colleges, and it is what gives the lie—directly, forcefully, daily—to the claim that what goes on in the classroom is an economic transaction. Teaching is the "business" of creating epiphanies, and this will always be best accomplished through the power of personal presence. It is conceivable that we might be seduced by the siren song of technology into believing in the romance of education without walls, not bound to time and place. Teaching could be turned over to machines. To do so, however, would be to offer a distinctly inferior mode of delivery. Technology is a marvelous adjunct to live teaching; it is no substitute for it.[37] It is safe to wager that students know this and will continue to recognize it so long as they are given the choice. Finally, we should remind ourselves that the uninhibited embracing of technology is part of an agenda that cares more for the bottom line than for the lives of students, and for which critical thought and democratic practice are mere annoyances.

Has the pace of the modern world outstripped academia? Here the Academic Senate finds itself in limited agreement with those who believe that change is in order. There is nothing inherently valuable about an eight-, or ten-, or sixteen-week time frame within which to teach a course and the Academic Senate feels that the community college of the twenty-first century should reflect a great deal more flexibility in scheduling than is currently the case. Nor is the Academic Senate opposed to the notion that many courses might lend themselves to modularization in order that the modules might be taken in shorter time frames.

In endorsing these sorts of changes, however, the Academic Senate feels that several caveats are in order. Flexible scheduling and modularization are often advanced as means for satisfying a perceived need for training and the rapid upgrading of skills. The Academic Senate would encourage community college instructors to see themselves, always, as engaged in education, and not mere training. The difference, as was indicated at the beginning, is that education is concerned with the whole person, with the promotion of humane values and critical reflection. The Academic Senate would ask that an instructor offering a short class on spreadsheets, for example, also introduce his/her students to the value of collegiality, and engage them in some discussion of the social issues, such as pollution and privacy, that accompany the widespread use of computers.

It should also be cautioned that, just as the eighteen-week semester has no special claim on subject content, so, too, the abbreviation of classes should not be viewed as an end in itself. Many subjects, particularly in the arts and humanities, require time for reflection and delectation as part of the learning process, and the penalty for not allowing for this is that violence is done to the subject matter. In short, community colleges can and should do more to accommodate the schedules of their students. Faculty, however, need to take care that the "need for speed" does not redound negatively on either the content or the process of their teaching.

On yet another point, the Academic Senate sees the demand that community colleges become customer-driven learning institutions, focussed on student outcomes, as of a piece with the agenda that would commodify knowledge and make colleges an extension of the marketplace. The learning institution that we are encouraged to become here is not one in which *student* learning is maximized; rather, it is one in which the *institution* "learns" to satisfy, uncritically and quickly, the demands of industry.[38] It is in fact a ploy to extend corporate welfare, a call, in short, for community colleges to take on employee training for local industry. In the name of advancing the interests of students, and with the promise of employment in the short-term, this call, if heeded, would in fact make students the pawns in someone else's game. Sound and humane education is no part of this program. It should be resisted and should play no part in our future.

On the other hand, there is a significant sense in which community colleges are failing to listen to their "customers" and to assist them toward their stated goals, and this is in the area of transfer. As was noted earlier, a large percentage of incoming California community college freshmen claim the achievement of a baccalaureate as their educational goal, yet a rather low percentage go on to transfer. Thus, however unwittingly, today's community colleges remain complicitous in the elitist program to stem the tide that would otherwise drown "the university proper." The Academic Senate believes that one of the most significant changes required of us is the effective abandonment of that complicity. This means, first, that the "cooling out function" will have to be made transparent. In fact, Student Right to Know legislation has already moved us in this direction. Now community colleges need to look at their own statistics and take them to heart and quit pretending that they are doing something that they are not. If we get students to give up their dreams by getting them to dream another dream, *we have still killed their dream!* One hundred years is long enough. Faculty are going to have to redouble their efforts at retention and remediation; they are going to have to give up Scantrons and insist that students write; they are going to have to maintain the very highest academic standards and find ways to bring under-prepared students up to that level. The community colleges have always represented the promise of open access to higher education. Our challenge for the future is to change that promise from a seduction to a reality.

Finally, another dimension to the question of access involves the question of "Access for whom?" The answer is, "For an increasingly diverse population," which in turn raises the question of how well the community colleges are prepared to meet the needs of this heterogeneous student body.

Writing in 1993, Aranowitz and Giroux state that "The great waves of immigration to our shores since 1980 provide a startling case study of the failure of social and educational policy. We are in the midst of a sea change in the demographic, social, and cultural composition of the United States." Yet, they maintain,

> Most school systems lack basic information about students of migrant (students from other parts of the United States and Puerto Rico) and immigrant backgrounds: they have little organized knowledge of their countries of origin, their families' socioeconomic position, the specific features of their native culture(s), and their expectations of schooling. While the new multicultural curricula have made some impact and some change has taken place in the culture of some urban secondary schools to take account of the changes in the school population, still strong counterpressures exist at the highest levels to retain and strengthen the uniform curriculum. The idea that equality of opportunity means the expectation that students may master a definite Eurocentrically based body of knowledge by the completion of high school is based on the assimilation assumptions that guided the early twentieth-century school reforms and still dominate the thinking of many "progressives" in education.

The situation, say Aranowitz and Giroux, is no better at the post-secondary level.

> ...Despite the growing diversity of college students, we can cite few examples of sensitivity by administrators and teachers outside language arts to the multiplicity of economic, social, and cultural factors that bear on a student's educational life in higher education. At best, some urban colleges and universities created ethnic studies programs in the 1970s that recognized diversity, but they strictly separated these programs from the traditional academic disciplines which, overwhelmingly, today remain bound to the old assumptions. As a result, there is a surprising paucity of courses and programs that integrate new student populations and their needs into the curriculum, counseling, and placement activities.
>
> As the evidence is increasingly showing, the historic assumption of immigrant "meltability" no longer obtains because many, if not all, immigrant groups hold fast to important elements of their native cultures while the prevailing economic situation gives them little reason to accept the standard curriculum as the key to a better life. The crucial culture war today is between, on the one hand, education institutions that do not meet the needs of a massively shifting student population and, on the other, students and their families who perceive schools as merely one more instrument of repression.[39]

As art is rendered safe by placing it in museums, so "multiculturalism" has been defused through the creation of departments of "ethnic" or "cross-cultural" studies without a concomitant insistence upon examining the whole curriculum. This has allowed some traditional disciplines to go on teaching their canons with a clear conscience to students who find them increasingly

irrelevant, or even "repressive." If the ideal of open access is to be realized, then, in the community college of the future, multicultural approaches and perspectives are going to have to be brought out of the closet and infused into the traditional disciplines in both the humanities and the sciences. The opening up that the Academic Senate is recommending will only be achieved when practitioners of these disciplines realize that their conceptions of truth and methods of inquiry reflect value judgments and modes of perception that are not universally shared. Creating this awareness is going to require a commitment to diversity in hiring, faculty professional development, outreach and student success on a scale that has yet to be evidenced.

CONCLUSION

It will not be too great a surprise that the faculty have concluded that in some essential ways the future of the community college ought to look very much like the present. Faculty can only urge in their defense that it is a conclusion at which they arrived through a critical assessment of their strengths and weaknesses.

The greatest strength of the community college lies in the quality of instruction that occurs there, and this is the product of knowledgeable and dedicated individuals functioning in a virtually ideal environment. A major theme in the call for the restructuring of the community college is a denigration of teaching and of the expertise of teachers, and an insistence that the teaching function can be more efficiently and economically achieved through technology. This view is predicated on the assumption that education is essentially an economic transaction in which information is exchanged for money. The faculty believes that this is fundamentally mistaken, and have argued that what goes on in the classroom is essentially a process in which human beings are created—or, to put it somewhat differently, in which their potential as human beings is actualized. This is not a function that faculty would see turned over to anyone—or anything—but other human beings, themselves knowledgeable, compassionate, humane and literate. It is here, in the teaching function, that faculty locate the true quality of the educational experience, a quality that is maximized when what is learned is how to be more fully human. Community colleges are teaching institutions *par excellence*, and the Academic Senate would not see that changed.

The Academic Senate would be clear, however, that it is rejecting only the extreme demand that technology serve as a replacement for faculty. The Academic Senate maintains that technology, both now and in the future, is a marvelous enhancement to instruction, and would urge that its potential continue to be explored and utilized. In addition, the Academic Senate applauds the fine work of those faculty who are developing course content for distance learning, who are maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity while ensuring increased accessibility to higher education for students in the future.[40]

It is concluded, as well, that community colleges have already evolved into life-long learning centers. This, along with their low cost and accessibility, positions them perfectly to serve their

communities in a knowledge-based economy, where rapid change makes lifelong-learning a necessity. It is this "perfect placement," however, that constitutes the appeal for those who would have the community college become community "training centers," and the Academic Senate counsels against playing such a diminished role.

The Academic Senate does not believe that California community colleges are in a perilous state of financial crisis, and believes that their fiscal future is relatively secure if they continue to secure and enjoy widespread public support and participation. They will also need to control administrative overhead and otherwise allocate resources rationally, and adhere to the guidelines set forth in the "2005" report cited earlier.

Many students already have frenetic schedules beyond the classroom, and one may expect this phenomenon to be compounded as more and more people begin coming to California community colleges for retraining and upgrading of their skills. The Academic Senate recommends that community colleges introduce a great deal more flexibility into their scheduling and consider more short-term offerings in order to increase accessibility. This recommendation is tempered, however, with the caution that these changes should never be made at the expense of educational quality.

The faculty has argued that the issues of diversity and of multicultural approaches and perspectives across the curriculum have yet to be squarely faced in California's community colleges, as evidenced by the fact that traditional disciplines in the sciences and humanities continue to reflect and, implicitly or explicitly, advocate mainly Western European values. The Academic Senate recommends and reaffirms the institution of wide scale diversity training and the infusion of multicultural approaches and perspectives in order that our instruction reflect a sensitivity to the alternative perspectives and value systems of an increasingly diverse student population.

Finally, while it can be said that community colleges have, however unconsciously, served a "cooling out" function, tracking under-prepared students away from four-year transfer programs into more modest educational paths, the Academic Senate urges that a primary goal of community colleges in the future be to repudiate this role. Further, the Academic Senate urges California community colleges to commit to providing programs and implementing practices that enable educationally disadvantaged students to achieve at a standard that makes access to all levels of higher education a reality.

Thus, the future the faculty envision is one informed by the hopes and the dreams of each subsequent generation for a full life. It is dedicated to the interconnectedness and mutual respect that must suffuse our state if we truly are to survive into the next century as a democracy. It insists that our educational mission and practice must meet that challenge and that all of us must do our professional best to realize those dreams in the classrooms (be they real or virtual), the counseling offices, the theaters and workshops, the libraries and the laboratories of our far-flung community institutions.

Endnotes

[1]. Peter F. Drucker, "The Age of Social Transformation," *The Atlantic Monthly* Nov. 1994: 53-80.

[2]. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: Free Press, 1966).
Ann Bastian et al., *Choosing Equality* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986).
Stanley Aronowitz and Henry Giroux, *Education Under Siege* (South Hadley, Mass.: Bergin and Garvey, 1985)
Martin Carnoy and Henry Levin, *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1985)

[3]. Walter Crosby Eells, *The Junior College* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1931) 54.

[4]. Steven Brint and Jerome Karabel, *The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989) 27.

[5]. Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 35.
Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College," *Sierra Educational News* Oct. 1920: 483-486, quoted in Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 87.

[6]. Alexis F. Lange, "The Junior College with Special Reference to California," *Proceedings of the National Education Association*, (Oakland: NEA, 1915) 119, quoted in Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 24.

[7]. William Rainey Harper, "President's Annual Report, University of Chicago, July, 1902," in *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, vol. I (Chicago, 1902), p. xcvi, quoted in L. Steven Zwerling, *Second Best* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976), 47.
This same attitude toward the community college is found repeatedly in the literature:
"One of the merits of these new institutions will be the keeping out of college, rather than leading into it, young people who have no taste for higher education." Abbott Lawrence Lowell (President of Harvard), "The Outlook for the American College," in R. L. Kelly, ed., *The Effective College* (New York: Association of American Colleges, 1928), 281-288.
"The university is primarily designed for one type of mind and the junior college for another." Robert G. Sproul (President of the University of California), "Certain Aspects of the Junior College," *Junior College Journal* 1(5) 1931: 274-280.
"When I was guiding the development of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California in 1959 and 1960, I considered the vast expansion of the community colleges to be the first line of defense for the University of California as an institution of academic renown." Clark Kerr, "Higher Education: Paradise Lost?" *Higher Education* 7 (Aug. 1978), 267.

[8]. Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 32-41.

[9]. Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 43-46.

[10]. Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, *The New Basic Agenda: Policy Directions for Student Success*, March 1996, 5.

[11]. Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 113-119.
David W. Breneman and Susan C. Nelson, *Financing Community Colleges: An Economic Perspective* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1981), 86.
Elizabeth Monk-Turner, "Sex, Educational Differentiation and Occupational Status: Analyzing Occupational Differences for Community and Four-Year College Entrants," *Sociological Quarterly* 24 (1983): 393-404.

[12]. Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 122-124.

[13]. American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, *A Gallup Study of the Image of and Attitudes Toward America's Community and Junior Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: AACJC, 1981), quoted in Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 230.

[14]. The California Community College Chancellor's Office's "Report on Transfers and Degrees and Certificates Awarded 1995-96" (Internet: http:// www.cccco.edu/cccco/gen/deg.htm) indicates that, in 1995, the transfer rate of California community college students to the UC and CSU systems was 4.6%, and that only 6.7% of the 1.3 million students in California community colleges achieved terminal certificates or degrees. *The New Basic Agenda: Policy Directions for Student Success*, published by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges in March 1996, indicates that 42% of incoming community college freshmen state that attaining a baccalaureate degree is their educational goal. Such numbers, taken by themselves, suggest that community colleges are, indeed, performing the function assigned them by their founders, of tracking students away from the 4-year colleges and universities.

[15]. On this view, the systematic dimming down of students' aspirations, assisting them in the discovery that they are not "college material," and tracking them into pursuits more commensurate with their abilities, is perceived as a valuable social function. See:

Burton Clark, "The 'Cooling-Out' Function in Higher Education," in A. H. Halsey et al., eds., *Education, Economy, and Society* (New York: Free Press, 1961) 513-521.

"The 'Cooling-Out' Function Revisited" in *New Directions for Community Colleges* 8(4): 15-32.

[16]. Patrick McCallum, Executive Director, FACCC, Presentation to the Academic Senates of the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District, January 22, 1998.

[17]. United States President's Commission on Higher Education, *Higher Education for American Democracy* (New York: Harper Bros., 1948), vol. 3, 7-8.

[18]. Brint and Karabel, *op. cit.*, 220-232.

Leonard V. Koos, *The Junior College* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1924), 144-166.

_____, *The Junior College Movement* (Boston: Ginn, 1925), 121-145.

[19]. California Master Plan for Higher Education, 1960.

[20]. Dion Dennis, "Brave New Reductionism: TQM as Ethnocentrism," *Education Policy Analysis Archives* May 3, 1995, Internet: http://olam.ed.asu.edu/epaa.

[21]. Dion Dennis, *op. cit.*, 1.

[22]. Dion Dennis, *op. cit.*, 10.

[23]. John E. Roueche, Workshop conducted for the Grossmont-Cuyamaca Community College District, San Diego, Ca., August 18, 1997.

See also: John E. Roueche, Laurence F. Johnson, Suanne D. Roueche and Associates, *Embracing the Tiger: The Effectiveness Debate and the Community College* (Austin: Community College Press, 1997).

[24]. The effort to quantify educational quality is also addressed in "Performance Based Funding: A Faculty Critique and Action Agenda," a paper published by The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, adopted in Spring 1998.

[25]. Don Doucette, "The Community College Niche in a Competitive Higher Education Market," *Leadership Abstracts* 10(2) Feb. 1997.

[26]. Western Governors University is an example of an online degree-granting institution, with no full-time faculty. See, on the WEB, http://www.wgu.edu/wgu/indcx.html. See also, Mark Snowhite, "Western Governors University: A Crisis for Accreditation" in *Senate Rostrum: the Newsletter of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges*, October 1998.

[27]. W. Edward Deming, *The New Economics for Industry, Government, Education* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Center for Advanced Engineering Study, 1993), quoted in Dion Dennis, *op. cit.*, 9.

[28]. Alan J. Frey, Community College Association Staff Consultant, Workshop conducted for the Summer Institute for Faculty Leadership, the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, Monterey, Ca., June 20, 1997.

[29]. For a measured analysis of financial needs of the California community college system, see "2005: A Report of the Task Force for the Chancellor's Consultation Council," published by the Chancellor's Office, September 26, 1997.

[30]. Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, "Funding Patterns in California Community Colleges: A Technical Paper for the 2005 Task Force of the Chancellor's Consultation Council," Policy Analysis and Management Information Services Division, November 1997, p.9.
Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, "Report of the 2005 Task Force of the Chancellor's Office Consultation Council," Policy Analysis and Management Information Services Division, November 1997.

[31]. Chancellor Tom Nussbaum, "Weekly E-mail Update," August 21, 1998.

[32].The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, "Performance Based Funding: A Faculty Critique and Action Agenda," Adopted Spring 1998.

[33]. California Citizens Commission on Higher Education, "A State of Learning: California Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century." Report published June 1998.

[34]. Lawrence C. Soley, *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia* (Boston: South End Press, 1995).

[35]. Jerry Sue Thornton, "Mission Possible: Community Collaboration," Presentation to the Nineteenth Annual Conference on Teaching and Leadership Excellence of the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD), Austin, TX., May 27, 1997. Dr. Thornton is president of Cuyahoga Community College, and received her Ph.D. from John Roueche's Community College Leadership Program.

[36]. University of Phoenix Web site: http://www.uophx.edu/uop/_gettokn.htm.

[37]. Eugene Heath, "Two Cheers and a Pint of Worry: An On-Line Course in Political and Social Philosophy," *Teaching Philosophy* 20:3, September 1997. 277-300. See especially pages 292-297, in which Heath articulates precisely why face-to-face instruction is superior to its on-line counterpart.

[38]. Terry O'Banion, "The Purpose, Process, and Product of the Learning Revolution in the Community College," *Leadership Abstacts* 10(7), July 1997.
See also: Terry O'Banion, *A Learning College for the 21st Century* (Phoenix: Oryx Press, 1997).

[39]. Aranowitz, Stanley, and Giroux, Henry A. (1993) *Education Still Under Siege* (pp. 2-7). Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

[40]. The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges, "Guidelines for Good Practice: Technology Mediated Instruction." Paper adopted Fall 1997.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE FOR CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
910 K Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 445-4753 Fax: (916) 323-9867 E-Mail: asccc@ix.netcom.com
http://www.academicsenate.cc.ca.us